EXHIBIT 2

Pages 1 - 21 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA BEFORE THE HONORABLE WILLIAM H. ALSUP, JUDGE WAYMO, LLC,)) Plaintiff, No. C 17-00939 WHA VS.) UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., et al., Defendants. San Francisco, California Thursday, March 16, 2017 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS **APPEARANCES:** For Plaintiff: QUINN, EMANUEL, URQUHART & SULLIVAN LLP 50 California Street 22nd Floor San Francisco, California 94111 BY: CHARLES K. VERHOEVEN, ESQ. JORDAN R. JAFFE, ESQ. DAVID A. PERLSON, ESQ. MELISSA J. BAILY, ESQ. For Defendants: MORRISON & FOERSTER, LLP 425 Market Street San Francisco, California 94105 BY: ARTURO J. GONZALEZ, ESQ. MICHAEL A. JACOBS, ESQ. Reported By: BELLE BALL, CSR 8785, CRR, RDR Official Reporter, U.S. District Court

(Appearances continued, next page)

```
Thirty-five..
 1
          THE COURT:
         MR. GONZALEZ: Oh, okay. Thirty-five.
 2
         THE COURT: Twenty-eight is the old days. All right.
                                                                 When
 3
     will that -- do the math for me. When will that -- I want to
 4
 5
     know, will that come up before the preliminary-injunction
     hearing?
 6
          THE CLERK: That will put it roughly around May 4th, I
 7
     believe, Your Honor.
 8
         MR. GONZALEZ: Yeah.
 9
          THE COURT: So --
10
11
         MS. BARTOW: We can file it sooner.
          THE COURT: I'm not -- I mean, I don't want to go through
12
      the pain and suffering of a preliminary injunction hearing if it
13
     has to be arbitrated, is the point. Think that through.
14
         But here's the other thing I want to you do. You asked for
15
16
     an early trial in your papers.
17
         MR. VERHOEVEN: Yes, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: What is your view on the early trial?
18
         MR. GONZALEZ: Your Honor, our view is that there's going to
19
     be a lot of work to be done on this case. So --
20
         THE COURT: Well, your view would probably change if there
21
     was a preliminary injunction.
22
         MR. GONZALEZ: It probably would.
23
         THE COURT: Yeah. So before you know the answer, I would
24
     like for both of you to meet and confer, and come up with a
25
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
schedule that would lead up to a trial on October -- first
Monday in October, which is October 2. I could try this case if
you could get it prepared and ready for trial on October 2nd.
   I'm talking about the final trial, not -- but that would
mean doing a lot of homework between now and then. And it could
be done, but it also -- I understand that it would be faster
than normal.
    But while you both have an incentive before you know the
answer on preliminary injunction, while you both have an
incentive to possibly consider an early trial, I want you to
work out that date, work out what the -- what the schedule would
be for disclosure of experts and everything else, and then give
that to me on the day you come back for your motion on the
arbitration. Okay?
    MR. GONZALEZ: We will do that. Thank Your Honor.
    THE COURT: All right. Here's another problem. I
anticipate that there's a 50/50 chance -- and I could be wrong,
but there's a 50/50 chance that whenever your side, meaning --
    MR. VERHOEVEN:
                   Waymo.
    THE COURT: -- Waymo, wants to take the deposition of
Mr. Lev- --
    MR. VERHOEVEN: Levandowski.
    THE COURT: -- Levandowski, that there will be a last-second
delay, because you say he needs separate counsel. That will not
be good. So I want you -- you're on notice you need to be
```

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER I, BELLE BALL, Official Reporter for the United States Court, Northern District of California, hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. Friday, March 17, 2017 Belle Ball, CSR 8785, CRR, RDR